URGE Complaints and Reporting Policy for UC Riverside ENSC and EPSP Depts

This is what was found by UCR Grad Pod #1 at UC-Riverside on policies for handling complaints, the reporting process, resources, and possible outcomes. Some information was public; answers that were only found through follow up with contacts are noted.

- The link(s) to the reporting policy at our organization are here:
  - Most useful link for reporting at UCR: help@ucr.edu
  - Environmental Sciences Dept:
    https://envisci.ucr.edu/about/diversity-equity-and-inclusion, newly-formed DEI committee
  - UCR policies: https://diversity.ucr.edu/policies-and-guidelines,
  - Earth and Planetary Sciences: Anonymous Survey sent out every year, DEI committee **it was mentioned that website should be updated with diversity statement and current committee members
  - Policy review and proposal mechanisms are stated here (along with new policies enacted and those undergoing review):
    https://compliance.ucr.edu/policies#proposed_presidential_uc_policies_or_procedures_or_proposed_revisions. Seems that policies are reviewed when needed and this is where changes are made public including new policies.

- What mechanisms are available for reporting complaints, bias, microaggressions, harassment, and overt racism?
  - Who are the designated individuals/positions for reporting incidents? ○ Can reports be made online? Where? Yes/No, Link Anonymously? Yes/No ○ Who do in-person and online reports go to? Who has access to see reports? Names and/or positions or “Not publicly listed/Unknown”
  - Are police included in the process? Yes, police are involved in ‘emergency situations’, though currently campus taskforce underway to determine alternatives/police reform. Previous attempts at safety taskforces over the last few decades have seemed to have not enacted substantial policy changes that many organizations (e.g. Black Student Union) were calling for. When and how? Are individuals accompanied by an advocate or someone from the organization? No clear advocacy groups made available in emergency situations, but help.ucr.edu does provide resources via a flow chart
● What are the outcomes or consequences for reported individuals? ○ Follow-up by supervisor, training (bias, etc.), disciplinary action, termination. This information on specific actions taken relative to offenses report seems unclear upon perusal of website/discussion with Graduate Division. ○ Who decides the outcomes/consequences? What is the process? ○ Are reports tracked? Reports are tracked, but process could be more transparent. How are they tracked? By who? ○ Are repeated complaints escalated to a disciplinary board? What is the process?

From the Title IX/EEOA flow chart (link):
   “Parties notified of investigation findings and may request a copy of the Investigation Report. Investigation Report sent to the appropriate officials for action or discipline”
   And
   “If misconduct found, referred for disciplinary action” (very vague language - process could be more transparent)

● What resources are available for individuals reporting?
   ○ Counselors or advocates, especially those of the same race, ethnicity, and gender.
   ○ Automatic or requested investigation of potential impact on grades or evaluations.
   ○ Protection against retaliation or repercussions, accommodations for continuing work/courses, option for pass/fail or outside assessment.

UCR’s Counseling and Psychology Services - https://counseling.ucr.edu/
   In non-covid times offer walk-in crisis counseling
   Offer support groups for students based around mental health and wellness themes
   Confidential source of support

Student Affairs Case Management - https://casemanagement.ucr.edu/
   Private but non-confidential way for students to seek assistance in a crisis
   Case managers can direct students to the proper resources on campus to assist them

Campus Advocacy, Resources, & Education - https://care.ucr.edu/
   Confidential resource for students to report Title IX violations

   Can report a complaint anonymously
   Their wording about confidentiality: “The University shall protect the privacy of individuals involved in a report of Prohibited Conduct to the extent permitted by law and by university policy and procedures.”
However, it should be recognized that an investigation may involve interviews with a number of persons to inquire if they have relevant evidence, and extremely sensitive information may be gathered. While such information is considered confidential, university policy and procedure may also require the disclosure of certain information during or following an investigation.”

Offer flow charts of the process involved but no resolution timelines: https://compliance.ucr.edu/discrimination-and-harassment-complaint-resolution-0#how_do_i_file_a_discriminationharassment_complaint

UCR Graduate Division

Specific for graduate students, grievances about PI harassment/bullying and conflict resolution mediation can be made to Graduate Division through the Associate Grad Division Dean, currently Ertem Tuncel (ertem.tuncel@ucr.edu). However one issue brought up in a recent meeting between Grad Division and our dept DEI committee was that under the Academic Freedom Clause afford to all faculty in the UC system, the outcome of grievances remains confidential and can never be disclosed to students who have been victimized (i.e. power is still very much). Therefore, it is not a transparent process. The number of reports issued every year and their outcome are not currently publicly available, though Dr. Tuncel did say he was pushing to have this info accessible on their website.

• What resources are available to groups raising issues or proposing changes?  ○ Petitions of # signatures trigger a town hall, meeting with organizational leadership, or policy change. What is the follow-up process for town halls and meetings?  ○ Working groups or committees with power to change or propose changes to policy.  ○ Cultural surveys, regular or only after wide-spread reports or high-profile incidents.  ○ Leadership proactively asks students and/or staff for input on how to improve.

Current tenure/promoting structure (heavily weighted towards research activity/achievements):

-> achievements

-> teaching evaluations (but can include curriculum development and writing chapters for textbooks)

-> administrative and professional assignments

-> research activity (# of publications)
We discussed broadly how there is not enough weight put into these evaluations for tenure or promotion related to ability to be effective mentor/advisor and it is unclear whether professional misconduct is ever factored into this equation.
URGE Pod Agreement for University of California, Riverside

This agreement is between UCR Faculty URGE Pod and department chairs Michael McKibben (EPSci) and David Volz (EnvSci) at University of California, Riverside. Our Unlearning Racism in Geoscience (URGE; [www.urgeoscience.org](http://www.urgeoscience.org)) pod has the following meetings scheduled with the Michael and David:

- Meeting 1 - Introduction to URGE and Discussion of Pod Goals - 2/8/2021 1-1:10 pm
- Meeting 2 - Invitation for leadership to attend a regular pod meeting - Date/Time or TBD
- Meeting 3 - Follow-Up Discussion of Pod Proposal and Actions - Date/Time or TBD

We are committed to URGE's primary objectives:

1. Deepen the community’s knowledge of the effects of racism on the participation and retention of black, brown, and indigenous people in Earth, Planetary, and Environmental Sciences
2. Use the existing literature, expert opinion, and personal experiences to develop anti-racist policies and strategies
3. Share, discuss, and modify anti-racist policies and strategies within a dynamic community network and on a national stage.

We are committed to our pod's objectives:

1. Discuss and assess the racial justice, equity, and inclusivity of our organization.
2. Develop an anti-racism Action Plan with actions specific to issues at University of California, Riverside, including methods for measuring and reporting progress. We are committed to pursuing these objectives individually, as a pod, and as an organization.

Pod Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam Ying</th>
<th>Environmental Sciences</th>
<th>David Volz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryjo Brounce</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>Michael McKibben</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jen Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samiksha Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Avila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis Fraústo-Vicencio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon Abernathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Puespoek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntal Chaudhuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Ostberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Zill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyson Fresquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaela Leung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Guilinger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>